THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

June 28, 1984

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: August 1, 1984, Wednesday
September 12, 1984, Wednesday

B. Approval of May 13, 1984 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

C. Reappointment of Hugh C. Miller, AIA as a member of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants for 3 years.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Zoning Commission

CFA 28/JUN/84-1, Techworld, 8th and I Streets, N.W., preliminary designs referred to Commission of Fine Arts for comments on use of public space, aesthetics, and relation to site of proposed hotel, commercial structure.

B. District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 84-200, 800 & 900 30th Street, N.W., Washington Harbour Associates, revised concept designs for Hotel/ Commercial project, (previous, O.G. 84-65).

a. National Park Service exchange of easement 20-foot height limit on site for related adjacent park additions, improvements to existing park areas and public easements.

b. Concept designs for building.

2. O.G. 84-184, 3504 Winfield Lane, N.W., Convent Gardens, Inc., The Cloisters, Phase I, additional houses, conceptual designs.

3. O.G. 84-196, 1229 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., Shalom Baranes, concept designs for new commercial bldg.

Appendix 1.

Shipstead-Luce Act

S.L. 84-62, 748 Jackson Place, N.W., Decatur House, restoration of balconies and removal of shutters.

Appendix 2.

C. District of Columbia, Department of Public Works

CFA 28/JUN/84-2, Police District #7 Building, Alabama Avenue & Irving Street, S.E., designs.

D. Congress of the United States, Committee on House Administration

1. CFA 28/JUN/84-3, H.R. 5611, a bill to authorize the Eleventh Airborne Division Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

2. CFA 28/JUN/84-4, H.J. Res. 482, a bill to authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc., to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia or its environs.

3. CFA 28/JUN/84-12, H.J. Res. 582, a bill to authorize the Armored Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to establish an "American Armored Force" memorial on Federal land in Arlington, VA.

E. Department of State

CFA 28/JUN/84-5, International Center Project, Van Ness and Reno Rd., N.W., Northwest Quadrant, final plans and landscape drawings.

F. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 28/JUN/84-6, Museum of Natural History, proposed addition of insulating windows to exterior.

G. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 28/JUN/84-7, Addition to NCO Club, Bolling Air Force Base, designs.

H. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

CFA 28/JUN/84-8, National Medal to honor Danny Thomas.

I. Red Cross, National

CFA 28/JUN/84-9, Civil War Memorial Building, Facilities for the Handicapped, ramp design confirmation.

J. General Services Administration

CFA 28/JUN/84-10, The President's Guest House, Pennsylvania Avenue & Jackson Place, N.W., proposed alterations to the Pennsylvania Avenue facade, new two-story addition in garden area, new garden design, (previous, 10/APR/84-7).

K. PADC

CFA 28/JUN/84-11, Roof Deck, Sears Bldg., 7th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-178 HPA. 84-362	3337 P Street, N.W. Jean P. Briffaux	Greenhouse

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to parts visible from public space.

O.G. 84-179 HPA. 84-428	3310 P Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. F. Mark Wyatt	Rear porch

ACTION: Issue permit for revised drawing received and dated 14 June 1984.

O.G. 84-181 HPA. 84-433	3259 N Street, N.W. Ronald S. Lauder	Stoop replacement

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-182 HPA. 84-435	3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown University	New animal facility

ACTION: Issue permit for new animal facility building as shown on working drawings received and dated 15 June 1984. Brick and trim shall match existing materials.

O.G. 84-185 HPA. 84-441	3543-51 Winfield Lane, N.W. Porten-Sullivan	New townhouses

ACTION: (See O.G. 194-195).

O.G. 84-186 HPA. 84-449	1209-17 28th Street, N.W. Corcoran Ltd. Partnership	New townhouses

ACTION: Issue permit for new townhouses as shown on working drawings received and dated 11 June 1984. Submission conforms to previously approved design (see O.G. 84-86). Request sample panel of brick be erected on site for inspection by CFA.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-187 HPA. 84-454	3028 O Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. T.J. Stanley	Residential renovation

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-188 HPA. 84-457	3028 N Street, N.W. Richard L. Kramer	Renovations & additions

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-189 HPA. 84-460	1241-1247 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Canterbury Tales Ltd. Partnership	Retail renovation & remodeling

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation and remodeling of buildings as shown on drawings received and dated 12 June 1984. Note change made on drawing, approved by applicant, substituting caststone for proposed wood trim.

O.G. 84-190 HPA. 84-461	1300 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Perpetual American Bank	Replacement signs

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed signs as shown on drawings received and dated 15 June 1984.

O.G. 84-191 HPA. 84-462	1050 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. Perpetual American Bank	Sign

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Resubmit design for sign to hang from arcade soffit and back of property and building face line.

O.G. 84-193 HPA. 84-464	3403 Dent Place, N.W. Tina Conner	Roof deck & new siding & windows

ACTION: Issue permit.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-194 HPA. 84-465	3536-3576 Winfield Lane, N.W. Porten-Sullivan Corp.	New townhouses: Conceptual

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-195 HPA. 84-466	3601-3619 Winfield Lane, N.W. Porten-Sullivan Corp.	New townhouses: Conceptual

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-198 HPA. 84-469	2710 P Street, N.W. Charles H. Marshall	Close window for bath

ACTION: Issue permit. Suggest face of brick surrounding vent frame be recessed back of wall plane an inch or two to recall original window opening.

O.G. 84-199 HPA. 84-470	2820 O Street, N.W. Schneiderman residence	Renovations & remodeling

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 84-201 HPA. 84-474	3014 N St., N.W. Benjamin Bradlee	Pool house: Conceptual

ACTION: Issue permit. Concept drawings as submitted, are sufficient for final approval by CFA. No further review is required.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-118 HPA. 84-238	3210-16 Grace St., N.W. Louise Cox	New four story building: Conceptual

ACTION: Concept approved for design development which shall be submitted to Commission for review and approval when ready. Working drawings and material samples shall be submitted for approval as ready prior to permit issuance. Brick and mortar samples shall be erected on site for approval prior to construction.

O.G. 84-154 HPA. 84-355	1524 28th Street, N.W. 1524 28th St., Limited Partnership	Change in approved materials for addition

ACTION: Issue permit for wood siding over concrete block on addition to existing house. Note that the applicant has agreed to return to wood siding as originally approved by the Commission (See O.G. 84-06).

O.G. 84-162 HPA. 84-387	3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown University	New student housing: Conceptual

ACTION: Concept approved subject to submission of further design developments to Commission of Fine Arts for review and approval. Details; material samples and working drawings shall be submitted prior to permit issuance.

O.G. 84-163 HPA. 84-393	3264-70 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park II Associates	New two-story retail building: Conceptual

ACTION: Concept approved subject to submission of further design developments to Commission of Fine Arts for review and approval. Recommend additional study of canopies proposed to flank the old market building. Recommend decreasing the canopy length by one bay at each end which would expose more of the original building and allow several of the arches to be visible without looking through glass end-panels or under the awnings. New building shall have additional design studies of the corner facing canal and market to give more articulation to the corner tower. Other tower elements may also benefit from additional articulation. Applicant shall further study relationship of retaining wall and new towpath stair. These studies should be coordinated with National Park Service.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-170 HPA. 84-411	3217 K Street, N.W. Altman's Parking	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit for new proposed parking sign, provided applicant agrees that the sign will consist of illuminated white letters on an opaque dark background.

O.G. 84-174 HPA. 84-414	3106 N St., N.W. Gerald & Ellen Sigal	Third floor addition

ACTION: No objection to the concept of alterations and additions as shown on drawings received and dated May 16, 1984. Present working drawings to the Commission of Fine Arts prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 84-175 HPA. 84-419	3504-32 Windfield Lane, N.W. Convent Gardens Corporation	Eight new townhouses: Conceptual

ACTION: Resubmit for additional study. No objection to the concept of eight new townhouses. Design as submitted is not acceptable. The concept of garage entrances depressed below grade not recommended for this development. No objection to garage on grade. Suggest consideration of courtyard scheme to minimize appearance of garage entrances. Provide materials illustrating visual continuity with Phase II of the Cloisters development. Because of importance of architectural details, special consideration should be given to craftsmanship and choice of manufacturers. Central pediment in a non-axial scheme should be reconsidered. Rear of the proposed row of eight townhouses need not mirror the front elevation, but reflect the difference in orientation and the design opportunities inherent at a location generating greater outdoor usage.

O.G. 84-177 HPA. 84-423	3330-3332 Dent Place, N.W. Sur-Trading Co.	Two new single family houses: Conceptual

ACTION: Resubmit after additional study. No objection to the concept of two new single family houses. Entrances should be adjacent to each other, with garage doors at either side. This recommendation will help to establish two curb cuts which in dimension will be more familiar to the Georgetown Historic District. It will also offer an opportunity to develop a design capable of establishing a common central theme shared by both houses, specifically at the double entrance and main floor levels. Lastly, it is recommended that the architect reduce the apparent height of the proposal by providing a mansard roof incorporating part or all of the third floor.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 84-37 HPA. 84-299	1503 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Riggs National Bank	One-story addition: Conceptual

ACTION: Concept for proposed addition to Riggs Banks at 1503 Pennsylvania Avenue is disapproved. Note attached copy of letter addressed to Carol Thompson concerning this submission.

S.L. 84-41 HPA. 84-359	601 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Westminster Investing Co.	New hotel and office

ACTION: Issue permit. Working drawings received and dated 3 May 1984 conform to the approved design submitted and reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts in July 1983.

S.L. 84-43 HPA. 84-364	501 13th Street, N.W. 13th & E. Joint Venture	Renovation

ACTION: Issue permit for entrance renovation as shown on drawing received and dated 26 April 1984.

S.L. 84-49	2500 Calvert Street, N.W. Shoreham Hotel Limited Partnership	New garage: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept and design of multi-story, underground garage as shown on drawings received and dated 9 May 1984. Submit working drawings, material samples and detailed site and landscape plan for approval by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to issuance of permit. (See O.G. 84-33).

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 84-51 HPA. 84-425	1435 G Street, N.W. Perpetual American Bank	Entrance to new ATM

ACTION: Issue permit for ATM and new lobby with access from Street. Proposed work will have little impact on exterior of building according to drawings received and dated 21 May 1984 (see S.L. 84-47).

S.L. 84-52 HPA. 84-412	215 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E. Hunan Dynasty	Awning

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Resubmit awning to match existing awning on same building east of Security National Bank.

S.L. 84-54	5198 27th Street, N.W. Harry Hagerty	Deck

ACTION: Issue permit for wood deck as shown on drawing received and dated 1 June 1984.

S.L. 84-55 HPA. 84-439	1776 D Street, N.W. D.A.R.	Driveway & site alterations

ACTION: Issue permit for exterior stonework and driveway alteration as shown on drawings received and dated 1 June 1984. Working drawings conform to approved conceptual submission (see S.L. 84-38).

S.L. 84-56 HPA. 84-444	223 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E. Jenkins Hill	Sidewall cafe

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to movable fence of wrought-iron pickets with weighted metal bases.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 84-50	1956 Calvert St., N.W. Emmanuel Gonzalez	Renovation & additions

ACTION: Issue permit for renovations, new stair tower and higher roof line. New roofing materials shall match color and texture of original. New masonry work shall match original brick in color, texture, size and mortar joint. Lintels of proposed new windows shall match existing lintels. Note: question use of combustible structural materials for proposed stair tower.

S.L. 84-58 HPA. 84-458	223 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E. Yolanda's	Alley awning

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 84-63 HPA. 84-491	1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Cadillac Fairview Urban Development	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit for temporary construction sign.

S.L. 84-57 HPA. 84-445	327-331 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E. Hawk 'n' Dove	Sidewall cafe

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to movable fence of wrought-iron pickets with weighted metal bases.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

28 June 1984

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. John S. Chase Hon. Walter A. Netsch Hon. Alan R. Novak
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
D. C. Historic Preservation Board staff member present:	Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 1 August 1984, Wednesday (tentative)
12 September 1984, Wednesday

B. Minutes of the 16 May 1984 meeting, approved.

C. Reappointment of Hugh C. Miller, AIA, as a member of the Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants for 3 years. Mr. Miller's reappointment was unanimously confirmed, and the Chairman expressed the Commission's appreciation of his services throughout his first term.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Zoning Commission

CFA 28/JUN/84-1 Techworld, 8th and I Streets, N. W.; preliminary designs referred to Commission of Fine Arts for comments on use of public space, aesthetics, and relation to site of proposed hotel, commercial structure. The Secretary noted that the Commission had received a letter from the Zoning Commission on 14 June asking for review of this project, although it does not fall within the boundaries of the Shipstead-Luce Act. He said the project had received much adverse criticism and the developers had decided to withdraw the submission from the agenda for this meeting.

B. District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 84-200, 800 & 900 30th Street, N. W., Washington Harbour Associates, revised concept designs for hotel/commercial project (previous O.G. 84-65).

a. National Park Service exchange of easement 20 foot height limit on site for related adjacent park additions, improvements to existing park areas and public easements.

b. Concept designs for building.

The Assistant Secretary pointed out the location of this project, at the junction of Rock Creek and the Potomac River. He recalled that at the January meeting the Commission had asked for coordination between the developer and the National Park Service and District government regarding those lands to be developed for park use. Recommendations regarding the design of the project had included reducing the height of the hotel and removing the tower elements at the Virginia Avenue axis. He said these recommendations had been met, and the monumental character of the Virginia Avenue axis further reduced by closing it with a glazed botanic garden and deleting the bridge that extended the axis across Rock Creek. The impact on Rock Creek had been lessened by a further stepping back of the office building and elimination or reduction of tower and bay elements on the hotel. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed these changes in the design and had issued a favorable report. He noted that a number of letters commenting on the project had been received, and that these and other items had been sent to the members to keep them informed of developments since they last reviewed the project in January. He then said that testimony would be heard at this meeting by the architect and developer, governmental agencies, citizens groups and individuals. He noted further that Frederick Green, the new director of planning for the District government, would be testifying.

John Parsons, representing the National Park Service, was the first to testify. He said his agency had been working with the developers since the January meeting, and he could report that there had been a vast improvement in the project, so much that the Park Service was now in total support and could be considered a co-applicant.

Robert Zimmer, president of Rosewood Hotels, was the next speaker. He reported that he had spent a great deal of time working with citizens groups, Washington Harbour Associates, and the Park Service to be sure that the project met the needs of all groups. He said he felt the historical nature of the site had been respected and that the setbacks, lower height, terracing, and the botanic garden had all helped to improve the project.

Architect Arthur Cotton Moore then discussed the changes in the design. He showed slides of the area, many of them aerial views, commenting that getting rid of the old industrial use of the Georgetown waterfront had been a long time goal, and that it had been the view of many that a combination of low scale buildings and park areas would be the best use for the area. He noted the Park Service's 20 foot easement on the eastern section of the site and said that a warehouse type development of that height had not seemed appropriate; hence the present scheme had been developed and negotiations with the Park Service undertaken. On a map he pointed out the areas in Phases I and II where some exchanges with the Park Service and/or the District government would be involved. These were: (A) The area between 31st Street and Wisconsin Avenue, now District land, to be transferred to the Park Service and developed as a park with the developer's aid; (B) A new pedestrian street on the line of Thomas Jefferson Street extended, perpetual public access guaranteed by the developer; (C) A guaranteed easement on the developer's land along the Potomac River; (D) the Mole area (Park Service land) to be landscaped and maintained by the developer; (E) A linear park on the west bank of Rock Creek, landscaped and maintained by the developer; (F) Stabilizing, landscaping, and maintenance of both banks of the creek by the developer; (G) Repair of the seawall along the Potomac between Thompson Boat House and 30th Street; (H) Restoration of the tidal lock at the mouth of the creek by the developer.

Mr. Moore than showed slides of drawings to discuss the changes that had been made in the design of both the hotel and office building. He said the number of rooms in the hotel had been reduced from 125 to 91, permitting the removal of one entire floor. All penthouses were gone, as were the towers at the Virginia Avenue gateway, which had reached a height of 76 feet. The tower and dome at Potomac River/Rock Creek had been replaced with a beveled corner and the size of a projecting bay reduced. These changes resulted in an overall height of 52 feet for the hotel. Drawings of the office building showed a structure 60 feet high,

plus a penthouse that would serve both buildings. The design of the building had been modified to provide a furthering tapering off toward Rock Creek. The actual footprint of both buildings had been reduced along the creek side. To meet the Commission's request to reduce the gateway effect at Virginia Avenue, a glazed conservatory structure similar in design to the U. S. Botanic Garden building, had been placed across the "street", connecting the two buildings. There was another conservatory feature, a bay on the Rock Creek facade of the hotel. Mr. Moore then discussed the visibility of the hotel from the surrounding area. He said that because of the tree density and the new plantings that would be placed on both banks of Rock Creek, the building would be almost hidden from view. He showed slides with balloons placed at a height of 52 feet, outlining the hotel structure, to prove this point. Turning to the 30th Street facade of the project, Mr. Moore noted that the design would be more formal, in the Beaux-Arts tradition, with rows of London plane trees bordering the pedestrian street. Service for both buildings would be provided by an underground floor, reached from the north end of the office building. Mr. Moore said the freeway ramp at the north would come down, and there would be a 6 foot easement added by the Park Service here to carry the pedestrian and bike path from the creek over to 30th Street. He added that pedestrian activity along 30th Street would be encouraged by many entrances, shops, and ample nighttime lighting. Lastly, Mr. Moore briefly addressed the problem of flood control, assuring the members that adequate precautions had been taken.

Landscape architect Joseph Brown was then introduced. He noted first that working drawings for the landscaping west of the hotel site were nearly ready, and then commented on landscaping plans for the area under consideration at this meeting. He reviewed the plan to place rows of plane trees along 30th Street and said the paving here would be a combination of brick, granite and cobblestones. Along Rock Creek the plantings would be doubled in number, and would include a lily pool and "wet feet" material along the edge of the creek. The old piers would be retained, with rip-rap and ground cover to hold the banks. The mole area would have a meadow type landscaping suitable to its open nature.

The next speaker was John Sheehan, testifying as a private citizen for the developer. He noted that this was his second appearance in support of this project and said he did not agree with the position taken by the Citizens Association of Georgetown. He said he had had some experience in economic matters, having been a member of the Federal Reserve Board, and was also the owner of a hotel. He said a small hotel on this site would not be profitable and the community should be happy that Rosewood still wanted to go ahead with its plans. He said it would beautify what was now an ugly waterfront and was a more practical option than a park that could not be financed. He noted that this development

would leave 14 acres of park on the waterfront with only 4 acres covered by buildings.

Frederick Green, the new director of planning for the District, was then introduced. He submitted for the record a letter of support from Curtis McClinton, deputy mayor for economic development. Mr. Green said the project had been given extensive review by his office, and it was considered architecturally appropriate for the area as well as offering a unique array of amenities--publicly accessible parkland, landscape, and restoration of the old canal lock. He said there was an appropriate mixture of land use and noted that the developer had responded to the Commission's recommendations regarding the design. Lastly, he observed that both the environmental impact and the Park Service easement had been addressed.

After Mr. Green spoke the members had some questions for representatives of the developer and the city government. The Chairman asked if there was a time limit on the developer's promised contribution to the park west of 31st Street. Thomas Regan, representing the developer, said the only condition was that the park must be under construction by the end of 1984. The Chairman then asked if the city would have its trucks and other equipment out of the area by that time; he was told by Terry Brooks, from the District government, that this equipment would be moved in that time period to a facility on Rhode Island Avenue. Mr. Chase asked who would maintain the park and was told by Mr. Regan that maintenance would be the responsibility of the Park Service. The Chairman asked when the city would transfer the land to the federal government and was told this would be done by the end of the year. He then asked what would happen to the maintenance of the park areas around the Rosewood Hotel should the hotel go out of business. He was told that its successors would be bound to maintain 30th Street south of K Street, the Mole and triangle area, east and west banks of Rock Creek, and the northern easement line. Washington Harbour Associates will maintain public access along the waterfront of Phase I, the Thomas Jefferson Street easement, and the 31st Street access. Mr. Netsch asked what would happen when the freeway ramp was removed and the service area at the north end of the office building exposed--would the developer be able to build on any of this property? Mr. Moore answered this by saying there was a no-build area there, but they would screen the GSA coal storage area to the north with trees to make the bike and pedestrian path more pleasant.

Two more citizens testified for the development. Luther Hodges, chairman of the National Bank of Washington, said he was impressed with the project, with the number of jobs it would create, the taxes it would bring in, and the expenditure of private funds to improve public lands.

He said he was acquainted with the Rosewood hotels and thought they were very good. Mrs. Nowak, resident of Georgetown, said she thought the design was beautiful and the accommodation with the various groups involved commendable.

Several people asked to testify against the development. Donald Shannon, speaking for Juan Cameron, president of the Georgetown Citizens Association, said the full membership of the association had voted in February to support the 20 foot height easement on this site so that development would be limited on the historic area at the mouth of Rock Creek. He also said there should have been an environmental impact statement on this development and that the Executive Order on Floodplain Management should have been adhered to. The Chairman took this opportunity to report that the Attorney General's office had just informed the Commission through a letter that the floodplain order was not germane to its advice, which under legislation, must be limited to matters of aesthetics. He asked Mr. Shannon if there had been any change in the association's position since February, and Mr. Shannon said that although there are no summer meetings of the membership, the matter had been discussed at board meetings and he did not think there had been any change. He said he would like to point out while he was testifying that too much weight was being given to the promises regarding landscaping; he felt this was being done to enhance the developer's own surroundings, not for the benefit of the public; he added that the same thing was true of Phase I of the project.

The next speaker was Cornish Hitchcock, an attorney representing several citizens groups: the Committee of One Hundred, the National Parks and Conservation Association, Human Environment Center, Committee for Washington's Riverfront Parks, and the National Audubon Society. He said that, first, the groups are opposed to permitting construction above the 20 foot easement line. Historically, they interpreted the easement as a way of saying industrial use of that area should be phased out and ultimately it should be park land. Then, after years of keeping the land from major development, a private individual made a deal with the Park Service and the park concept vanished. Secondly, Mr. Hitchcock said the groups thought the Executive Order on Floodplain Management should have been invoked in this case. (Mr. Hitchcock said he had not been aware of the Attorney General's letter just received by the Commission.) Thirdly, he said the Commission's review of this project was premature, and he was surprised to hear that the Park Service considered itself a co-sponsor of the application. He said a full environmental impact statement had not been made, and it had yet to be determined that the Park Service was receiving equal value for its transfer of land interests, as was required by law. He thought the Commission's review should wait until these considerations had been fully satisfied.

Mr. Netsch asked Mr. Hitchcock what kind of land use he thought was proposed when the easement was made; Mr. Hitchcock said he thought warehouse facilities at the time, with park or recreational use the ultimate goal. The Chairman pointed out, however, that this was some time ago, and the Park Service had never come up with the money to buy the land. He noted, though, that there were some questions of fact that should be addressed: the environmental impact statement and the question of equal value. Mr. Novak suggested that Mr. Parsons address these questions.

Mr. Parsons said that there had been 40 foot batching plants on the site, and the 20 foot easement was simply an attempt to get the height of waterfront structures down; there was no record that the Park Service intended to purchase the property. Recently, since the Task Force Agreement of 1979, he said the Park Service's efforts had been directed toward achieving as much as possible in the way of public access and setbacks to protect Rock Creek without federal purchase of land. He said the easement was the only land interest the federal government had in the area. In regard to the environmental question, he said the Park Service had been heavily criticized. The original environmental assessment had been revised and he said it was ready to be released to the public. In answer to a question, he said it was only an assessment, that a full environmental impact statement was not thought necessary. On the question of equal value, Mr. Parsons said they had been involved in active appraisal work for about two months, and while a final appraisal was not yet available, the appraisers had assured the Park Service that the value received would benefit the United States. He said compliance with the Executive Order on Flood Plain Management (Nos. 11998 and 11990) had been completed and was available for review. He said all this material would be submitted to NCPC in August and they would be asked to establish the Georgetown Waterfront Park which would run all the way to Key Bridge. Mr. Novak asked Mr. Parsons to summarize the environmental assessment. Mr. Parsons said that given the setbacks, floodplain control, and the park areas, it was considered that the impact would not be detrimental. As far as an increase in traffic was concerned, it was believed that it would be much less than if a 20 foot high shopping mall were built, which would be the alternative to the hotel/office development. He said the District government concurred with this. Air quality impact was determined to be minimal. Landscaping improvements were considered a plus environmentally, and the granting of public access also an amenity.

Mr. Novak expressed the Commission's concern that little by little, over the construction period, amenities promised would be withdrawn and the 14 acres of park out of 18 total would not be realized. He also asked about the District government's promises regarding the park west of 31st Street. Mr. Parsons said he thought the end of 1984 might be a little ambitious as far as transferring the District land was concerned,

but the Park Service would be willing to take jurisdiction immediately if that would speed up the process. Mr. Novak asked what percentage of the total cost of the park was represented by the one million dollars promised by the developer; he was told it was about 20%. Mr. Novak said the Commission wanted to be sure that this commitment, which was not tied to Phase I approval, was made part of any approval of Phase II. Ms. Judith Bonderman, who had appeared with Mr. Hitchcock, asked to comment. She said the million dollars was promised in 1981 before the D. C. Historic Preservation agent, but there was no condition made when the permit for Phase I was issued. She said the same thing applied to the previously promised easements along Thomas Jefferson Street and along the Potomac; they were not made binding. Mr. Regan, representing the developer, said there was no obligation on the part of the developer to make the contribution of money; it was purely voluntary and had remained outstanding since 1981. He said their only requirement is that construction begin somewhere around the end of 1984; he said they did not want the negotiations to go on and on forever.

Mr. Novak said that as a member of the Commission his reaction to the plan would depend on whether the commitments by the various parties could be nailed down, because they affect the aesthetics and the public good. Mr. Netsch asked if the Commission could get statements from those involved. Mr. Regan said the developer was willing to sign an agreement as soon as one was presented to him. Ms. Dennis, from the District government, said they were in the process of working out a statement and would give the Commission a copy. Mr. Novak asked where the other four million to complete the park would come from. Mr. Regan said these funds would come from the District or federal government--whoever owned the land. Mr. Parsons said the Park Service was anxious for the transfer to be effected and would seek an appropriation for the necessary funds.

The last speaker in opposition to the development was Sidney Howe from the Human Environment Center. He said his organization represented more than twenty grups opposing any commercial or residential development on this land. They felt that the twenty foot easement was there for good historical, aesthetic, and environmental reasons and should not be lifted. He said the Georgetown waterfront was one of the most conspicuous sites in the world and should be reserved for people to enjoy for recreational purposes.

The Commission then turned to a discussion of the design. Mr. Netsch observed that the discussion would have to be divided into two parts, aesthetic and technical; the Chairman agreed. Speaking for the aesthetics, Mr. Netsch said he had been pleasantly surprised at the willingness of the developer to listen to the Commission, and he believed a major effort had been made to respond to the Commission's previous criticisms of the design

and its effect on the river and Rock Creek. While he admitted that the design was not his "cup of tea", he found it a great improvement in scale over the first submission. His only criticism was that the conservatory link should have a softer, less formal aspect on the Rock Creek side. He added that the landscaping should be watched carefully and the existing growth not removed all at once, lest it expose a visually unpleasant scene, especially during construction.

Mr. Chase said he was still concerned about the encroachment onto public park space and the possibility of denial of public access. However, he said he was encouraged by the developer's response to the Commission's recommendations, and being familiar with the quality of the Rosewood hotels, thought the presence of one in Washington would be advantageous to the city. On this basis he said he would vote for approval.

Mr. Novak said that although he had not been present during the first presentation, he was impressed by the quality of the team and what they had done with both private and public spaces. He said Rock Creek was at this point in terrible condition, and it was now possible that it would become useable and enjoyable. But he added that he could understand people's concern over proper public development of the waterfront; he had originally thought that Phase I would be better than anything else obtainable, but he was not happy that the city had not bound the developer to his promises. Now, he said, the developer was promising the same things in order to get approval of Phase II. He thought the Commission should keep its hand in this and make sure such promises were made binding before construction began.

The Chairman said he took a similar position. He was pleased with the response of the developer and liked the development of the east bank of Rock Creek. He said he believed there was a consensus for the approval of the design but the approval should be made contingent on some promises being met. He said he could not agree with those still fighting for no development at all; the concept of a waterfront totally devoted to park uses, encouraged by the Commission in 1980, had not been successful, and the area had been urbanized. Now, he said, attention should be focused on rescuing the Rock Creek sliver of land from highway and industrial blight and developing the large park west of 31st Street. He thought this was now within the realm of possibility and suggested a vote, with approval of the design given contingent on the District's handing over jurisdiction of the area west of 31st Street to the Park Service, proof that the Park Service had obtained a proper appraisal and was receiving equal value, and assurance that the easement and maintenance agreements would be binding on the owners. The other members agreed with this proposal and the project was unanimously approved under the conditions stated by the Chairman.

Exhibits A, A-1

2. O.G. 84-184, 3504 Winfield Lane, N. W., Convent Gardens, Inc., The Cloisters, Phase I, additional houses, conceptual designs. Staff member Jeffrey Carson noted that this was a continuation of Phase I of this project with a new architect, Dunn and Brady. He said the submission was for eight houses, different in style from the Georgian type already constructed. These would be closer in style to late Victorian London. Mr. Carson said the Georgetown Board had seen the designs and approved them in concept. He introduced the architect, Mr. Brady, who located the site for the houses, at the beginning of a row. He said the Georgetown Board had seen the designs three times and some rearrangement had been made in the front yards, garages, and garage entrances before approval had been given. Height would be three stories and a basement, width 20-22 feet, and material brick, similar to that use for other houses in The Cloisters. There were no objections and they were unanimously given conceptual approval.

3. O.G. 84-96, 1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W., concept designs for new commercial building. The Assistant Secretary located the site for this building, now a parking lot, one-half block up Wisconsin Avenue from M Street. He said the design had been seen by the Georgetown Board and approved as far as mass and character were concerned, but that additional study had been recommended for the central and first floor motif. Frontage on Wisconsin Avenue would be 38 feet with a depth of 200 feet. Shalom Baranes, the architect, was then introduced. He said this would be speculative building, with retail in the basement and first and second floors, and office space above. He described the strong two story central element, employed to bring the eye up to the second floor retail space. He noted that the cornice had been moved to line up with the cornice of the building next door, at the suggestion of the Georgetown Board, and the central motif had been toned down and simplified, again, at the suggestion of the Board. It had been broken up into three elements, with awnings, instead of reading as one large central motif. The members thought the new sketches were moving in the right direction, although Mr. Chase thought the columns were too heavy. Mr. Netsch suggested thinking in terms of grace rather than exuberance as new studies were made. The Georgetown Board will review the new designs as they are ready.

4. Appendix 1, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 84-62, 748 Jackson Place, N. W.; Decatur House, restoration of balconies and removal of shutters. Staff member Sue Kohler informed the members that this submission came from The National Trust for Historic Preservation and concerned alterations to historic Decatur House, designed by Benjamin Latrobe in 1818. She said the

alteration requested for the front facade was the removal of second story window grilles, installed by architect Thomas Waterman in 1944, and their replacement with wrought iron balconies, thought to be those originally in place at these windows. While all early photographs did show balconies rather than grilles, she said that an examination of those photographs taken in 1937 by HABS revealed that the balconies were of a different design and in much poorer condition than those the Trust proposed to erect. She said the Trust's balconies were being used in the interior at Oatlands, another Trust property, and that there were five, rather than the three needed for the Decatur house facade. The Trust had suggested that the other two may have been used at the first floor windows, but Mrs. Kohler said these were too small for such balconies. For these reasons, the staff recommendation was that no alteration be made until further documentation could be carried out.

The second part of the submission concerned alterations to the H Street facade. Here the request was to remove all the louvered shutters, installed by Waterman in 1944, as well as one 1944 panelled shutter, in an attempt to restore the facade as closely as possible to its "as-built" condition; the only shutters shown in early photographs were panelled ones at three of the four first floor windows. Also, Mrs. Kohler said that the Trust thought that louvered shutters were not correct for the period of construction of the house. She pointed out, however, that such shutters, called "Venetian Blinds", were specified on Latrobe's drawings, although it was not clear which windows were to receive them. She also noted that removal of these shutters would not restore the facade to its "as built" condition, as an examination of the brickwork showed that the western-most windows on the first and second stories were moved at one time and opened up (having been shown as blind on Latrobe's drawings). She said it was the staff opinion that removing the shutters would only emphasize the misalignment and the unsatisfactory relationship of blind to open windows. The recommendation, therefore, was that no alterations be made until a thorough study of Latrobe's drawings and correspondence, as well as Waterman's notes, was completed and it was determined that alterations would be justified.

Mrs. Kohler then introduced Mr. Russell Wright from the Trust to make any comments or explanations and answer questions. Mr. Wright said he had come on board after the decision to request these alterations had been made and was not aware of the points brought up in the staff discussion. He said there had been several architectural periods and many people involved in the changes that have taken place in Decatur House and it was difficult to decide whose intentions to respect. He said he would like to withdraw the submission, and the Chairman and Mr. Netsch suggested he work with the staff and carry out further research. As the submission was withdrawn, no formal action was taken. Exhibit B

2. Appendix 2, approved.

C. District of Columbia Department of Public Works

CFA 28/JUN/84-2, Police District #7, building, Alabama Avenue and Irving Street, S. E., designs. The Assistant Secretary located the site for this building on an aerial photograph and then introduced Charles Pavlick from the District government, who in turn introduced Mr. Bianchi and Mr. Korth from the planning office of the Metropolitan Police Department, and Mr. Sulton, from the architectural firm of Sulton, Campbell and Associates. Mr. Sulton turned the presentation over to Richard Hines from his office to discuss the design. Mr. Hines noted that the Seventh District had been operating out of an apartment building and was badly in need of a separate facility. He said the new building would encompass 43,000 square feet in three floors, with the public entrance on Alabama Avenue and the police entrance facing the north side of the building. Adjoining the north side of the building would be parking areas and scooter storage, all enclosed with a six foot masonry wall. There would be recesses and setbacks in the wall and trees planted around the perimeter to relieve the severity, since the facility would be in a residential neighborhood. The main orientation of the building would be to Alabama Avenue, and a key element here would be a curvilinear element, two stories high, glazed with a translucent plastic material giving a kind of lantern effect when lighted at night. Brick would be the main building material and other windows would be tinted glass. There would be a community room in the curved section as well as police offices. The chief concern of the members was the effect of the translucent wall at night; it was thought important that furniture and other large objects be kept away from the wall so they would not block the light or look unattractive from the outside. It was suggested that a bench around the inside of the wall might prevent this. Other than this comment, there were no objections to the design and it was unanimously approved. It was strongly recommended that the proposal to plant trees along the wall be carried out. Exhibit C

D. Congress of the United States, Committee on House Administration

1. CFA 28/JUN/84-3, H.R. 5611, a bill to authorized the Eleventh Airborne Division Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

2. CFA 28/JUN/84-4, H.J. Res. 482, a bill to authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Funds, Inc., to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia or its environs.

3. CFA 28/JUN/84-12, H.J. Res. 582, a bill to authorize the Armored Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to establish an "American Armored Force" memorial on Federal land in Arlington, Virginia.

Mrs. Kohler discussed these three pieces of legislation together, saying they contained very similar, standard wording, with several exceptions, and were all to establish memorials. All would require the approval of the design by the Commission of Fine Arts. The exceptions to the standard wording were: (1) the Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial legislation contained language stating that the Commission must comment on the design within ninety days of receiving it, or its approval would be deemed to have been given; and (2) the Armored Force Memorial legislation mentioned a specific site--Memorial Drive in Arlington. The members thought that the Law Enforcement Memorial legislation should conform to the standard wording, noting that the Commission always makes every effort to respond promptly and meets frequently enough so that should be no problem. In regard to the site mentioned for the Armored Forces Memorial, the members thought while the Commission generally preferred that such legislation not be site specific, Memorial Drive was the ideal site for such memorials, and so in this case they would approve the site selected. There were no objections to the establishment of any of the memorials, and with the one exception to the wording noted above, the legislation authorizing all three was unanimously approved. Exhibit D, D-1, D-2 , D-3, D-4, D-5

E. Department of State

CFA 28/JUN/84-5, International Center Project, Van Ness & Reno Road, N. W., Northwest Quadrant, final plans and landscape drawings. Mr. Carson introduced Michael Newell from the State Department to discuss this project. Mr. Newell reviewed the long association of the Commission with the International Center project and said this submission was for the landscaping of the northwest quadrant, which contained sites for nine additional chanceries. He introduced landscape architect James Van Sweden to make the presentation. Mr. Van Sweden first told the members that the central park, previously approved, had been planted and the buffer park landscaping was ready to go out for bids. He said the northwest quadrant would be the third area to be landscaped, and the materials would be consistent with those used elsewhere--red brick paving, Martha Washington lights, stonybrook flagging for walls, and around the perimeter a Federal strip with groundcover and street trees (willow oaks). At the north end there would be a buffer zone between the embassy buildings and the residences in Yuma Street. This would be a small park, used by

embassy personnel during lunch time, and by the residents of the area after hours with the permission of the State Department. Trees would be added to those already there to screen the area from the street and there would be a perennial garden and groundcover.

The Chairman said that Mr. Stone, who was absent, had seen the drawings and had a few comments. He hoped that the large existing specimen trees would be kept (as Mr. Van Sweden had said they would be at the north end) and asked if the willow oaks along the sidewalk on the western end could be spaced more closely so as to reinforce and define the special character of the site. Mr. Van Sweden said that would not be a problem, and the specimen trees that were on building sites could be prepared for transplanting now. Mr. Stone also questioned the use of such lavish plant material in the northern park; Mr. Van Sweden said it was an area where people would be sitting very close to the plant material and would be interested in the variety and design. The last question concerned maintenance. Mr. Newell said that would not be a problem as there was a trust arrangement with the chanceries and the interest would provide ample maintenance money. There were no other questions and the landscaping plans were approved.

Exhibit E

F. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 28/JUN/84-6, Museum of Natural History, proposed addition of insulating windows to exterior. The Assistant Secretary told the members there was a mock-up of this window on the building that they could see after the meeting, and then intorduced Mr. Murphy from the Smithsonian. Mr. Murphy said the plastic insulating windows, planned for the large upper story windows, would be installed on the exterior; the pattern of the muntins would match the existing. He said the material had been selected because it matched the granite well and offered a significant energy savings over double glazing, which would be difficult because of the deterioration of the windows. Mr. Netsch thought this would have to be handled very carefully on a Classic building such as the museum, and he wondered if the plastic material could be put behind the windows. Mr. Chase asked if it would be reflective and Mr. Murphy said no, it had a dull pebble finish. The Chairman was concerned about the dark color. All agreed they would have to see the mock-up before making a decision.

(After the meeting the Chairman, Mr. Netsch, and Mr. Chase looked at the mock-up and were pleasantly surprised at the appearance. They agreed it was acceptable for the present but hoped that the original windows would be restored in the future.) Exhibit F

G. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

CFA 28/JUN/84-7, Addition to NCO Club, Bolling Air Force Base, designs. Mr. Carson said the architects for this addition were Clas Riggs Owens & Ramos. Lieut. Sarah Goodrich from the Navy was then introduced and showed drawings for the addition which would contain lounges, a ballroom, and offices. It would be in the same style as the existing building. There were no objections and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit G

H. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 28/JUN/84-8, National medal to honor Danny Thomas. Mrs. Kohler introduced George Schafer from the Mint to show designs for this medal. On the obverse was a portrait of Mr. Thomas holding a sick child, and on the reverse a drawing of St. Jude's Hospital, which Mr. Thomas founded. There were some suggestions for changes to the obverse, including a change in the position and lettering style of the word "Humanitarian" at the bottom. The members thought it would look better following the curve of the medal and done in the same lettering as "Danny Thomas", above. With this recommendation the medal designs were unanimously approved. Exhibit H

I. National Red Cross

CFA 28/JUN/84-9, Civil War Memorial Building, facilities for the handicapped, ramp design confirmation. The Assistant Secretary showed drawings of details of a handicapped ramp; he said the staff had worked with the Red Cross and the architect to find a location for this and to design it so it would have little visible effect. It was unanimously approved.

J. General Services Administration

CFA 28/JUN/84-10, The President's Guest House, Pennsylvania Avenue & Jackson Place, N. W.; proposed alterations to the Pennsylvania Avenue facade, new two story addition in garden area, new garden design. (Previous 10/APR/84-7) The Assistant Secretary recalled the previous conceptual review of plans to refurbish Blair House and build an addition in the garden; he said more definitive plans had been drawn and had been approved by the Planning Commission and the State Historic Preservation Board. He said these included some alterations to the two buildings next to the Commission's offices, most importantly, the replacement of the early twentieth century entrance to the more northerly of these buildings with one close to what originally existed. Some changes were also planned for the facades of the Blair and Lee houses to make them more consistent with the earlier period selected in the historic structures report prepared by the architect.

David Lingrell from GSA was introduced; he told the members that the primary thrust of the work was to provide better security for heads of state and increase fire safety, but as general renovation of the buildings was also needed, the opportunity was taken to do this in an historically correct way.

Before architect John Mesick began his presentation, the Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had two areas of concern after the first submission. The first was the inclusion of handicapped access to the rear of the Commission's offices, and he said that GSA had asked the architect to look into this. The second concern was that there might be too much red brick in the garden area; the suggestion was that the paving and facades of the addition be stone rather than brick; he said Mr. Mesick would discuss this. Mr. Lingrell reported that after a conference with the architect, it had been determined that a wheel chair lift would be the most unobtrusive solution to the handicapped access problem; the members all thought this an excellent idea.

Mr. Mesick then began his presentation. He said the modifications that were being proposed for the Blair and Lee houses had grown out of the historic structures report prepared by his firm. He showed slides of old views of the houses and the surrounding area, noting that while the Blair house was built in the Federal period, the Renwick Gallery, Lee house, and the three houses turning the corner at Pennsylvania Avenue and going up Jackson Place had all been built in 1859 and were originally red brick. In 1866 two floors had been added to Blair House, and in 1901 a third floor and attic floor were added to Lee house in the Federal style. Appendages were added to both houses throughout the years, and during Gist Blair's occupation of Blair house (1908-1940) the Victorianisms were removed and frequent renovations undertaken. Store fronts were added at the basement level of Lee house in 1919, and when the Carnegie Institution purchased the Jackson Place houses, the entrance to 704 was altered (1904). Mr. Mesick noted that the fake brownstone that had been used on the Renwick in the 1970 restoration was also used on the Jackson Place houses and would have to be removed because of deterioration. He said Lee house would be restored to its 1901-42 appearance; paint would be removed from the red brick, the brownstone trim restored, and the Italianate round arched windows put back at the basement level. Blair house would be restored to the period of the Gist Blair occupancy and would be given new stucco.

Mr. Mesick then discussed the new addition to be built in the garden, extending east to a point about 30 feet from the Commission's office. The ground floor would have glazed round arched openings and be used for receptions; the upper floor would be a guest suite for visiting heads of state. Concurring with the Commission's recommendation, Mr. Mesick said

the material would be a creamy colored Ohio sandstone and the building would have the effect of an 18th or 19th century pavilion. A basement would be excavated under the garden and adequate soil provided for growing trees. Mr. Mesick discussed other additions, such as elevators and fire stairs, and the necessity for using heavy security glass behind the windows. When Mr. Mesick had finished his presentation the Chairman commended him and the Commission unanimously approved the renovation and addition plans. Exhibit I

K. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 21/JUN/84-11, Roof deck, Sears Building, 7th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Mr. Carson said this submission was for structures on the roof of the former Apex Building, now the Sears Building, although actually they would be over the old Matthew Brady studio adjoining. A rendering showed polygonal, multi-level roofed structures, to be used for seating, and a pergola with gabled ends at the entrance to the deck. Mr. Maloney from PADC was introduced and told the members that his board had not yet seen this, and that it had already been modified in the direction of simplification and reduced visibility by the removal of an octagonal gazebo. He introduced Robert Berland from Sears to answer questions. The members were confused by the number of structures, levels and stairs until Mr. Berland explained that the roof sloped rather dramatically and this was a way to introduce level seating areas. He said the deck would be used for small, quiet parties, primarily at night. The biggest concern of the members was what could be seen from the street and how visible the nighttime lighting would be. Mr. Berland assured them that he would see that both structures and lighting would be only minimally visible. The Commission then agreed to approve the project with these cautions in mind. Exhibit J

This submission concluded the items on the printed agenda. The Chairman then noted the recent death of Nathaniel Owings and suggested that a resolution be prepared for the approval of the Commission, outlining Mr. Owings's contributions to the development of Pennsylvania Avenue and the improvement of the appearance of the city of Washington. The other members agreed that this would be appropriate.

The last item of business was the designation of Mr. Novak to sign the letters resulting from this meeting, in place of the Chairman, who would be on vacation.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT A

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mayor Barry:

A revised preliminary design for the Rosewood Hotel and Office building to be located on the Georgetown Waterfront was reviewed by the Commission at its meeting on June 28, 1984. I am happy to report that the proposal received the Commission's tentative approval although I should emphasize that our action is contingent on several conditions being met, at least two of which directly involve the District government.

Central to the developer's proposal is the promise to contribute one million dollars toward the development of a landscaped park immediately to the west of 31st Street between Wisconsin Avenue and Georgetown Harbours' Phase I development currently under construction. As you may recall, this offer was made during the governmental deliberations on the Phase I design, and it was the general assumption by the public and others, including this Commission, that the issuance of a permit for this project was contingent not only on such a donation by the developer, but also on his offer to guarantee perpetual public access to the landscaped area along the river bank in front of the new development. Regrettably these conditions were not made binding before issuance of the permit, and the developer was allowed to proceed free of his previous commitments to fund public improvements and guarantee public access. Given this background, it is imperative that the current proposal not proceed without a binding agreement between all parties that guarantees the fulfillment of such conditions.

It was reported at our meeting by representatives of both the Park Service and developer that they were nearing an agreement on an exchange of interests for the lifting of the twenty foot height restriction now in effect on the Rosewood site. However, it is doubtful, even with the donation of the developer, that the Park Service can go ahead with plans to implement the park scheme until the land is actually transferred from the District to the Federal government. Moreover, the developer indicated the donation may be withdrawn if construction permits are not received by December 30, 1984. Since establishing the new park is not only a key part of the agreement with

the Park Service but also an important contingency in the Commission's approval, we urge you to proceed with the transfer of land as soon as possible. The public interest has already suffered a loss of benefits originally promised in Phase I through the omission of the boat basin and greatly diminished residential use. Phase II should not proceed to the permit stage, until it is clear the public will receive all it has been promised in Phase II.

The Commission knows of your continuing commitment to balance the new construction on the waterfront with the addition to our park system of the remaining lands along the river. This is a highly commendable position, and it is our hope that this commitment can be implemented in the very near future.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Honorable Marion S. Barry
Mayor of the District of Columbia
District Building, Suite 520
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT A-1

July 3, 1984

Dear Ms. Thompson:

At its meeting on June 28, 1984, the Commission reviewed a revised design for the Rosewood hotel and office building to be located on the Georgetown Waterfront next to Rock Creek. After extensive testimony on behalf of the developers and representatives of various civic organizations, the Commission voted to approve the plans for development of detailed working drawings. Final approval will be contingent on further review of design details, and the establishment of binding agreements between the National Park Service, the developer, and the District Government for certain exchanges of lands, easements and services, including a donation of funds by the developer, the transfer of land west of 31st Street for park purposes, and public access to the waterfront.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter to the Mayor on this same subject for your information.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer and
Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W., Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT B

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Ms. Thompson:

At its meeting on 28 June 1984 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a request by the National Trust for Historic Preservation to make alterations to the Jackson Place and H Street facades of Decatur House, 748 Jackson Place, N.W. (S.L. 84-62).

The alteration submitted for the Jackson Place facade was to remove window grilles (installed by architect Thomas Waterman in 1944) from the second story and replace them with wrought iron balconies, thought to be the ones in place before the 1944 restoration. While all early photographs do show balconies at these windows, an examination of 1937 photographs in the HABS collection reveals that they were of a different design and in much poorer condition than those the Trust proposes to erect. For this reason, the staff recommended that no alteration be made until further documentation can be carried out.

The alteration proposed for the H Street facade was removal of the 1944 louvered shutters and one 1944 paneled shutter in order to restore the facade to its "as-built" condition. The reasons offered for the alterations were that the only shutters shown in early photographs are paneled ones at three of the four first floor windows, and that louvered shutters were not correct for the period of construction. However, louvered or "Venetian" blinds are specified on Latrobe's drawings for the house, although it is not clear on which windows they were to be placed. Moreover, removing the shutters would not restore the facade to its "as-built" condition, as an examination of the brickwork shows that the westernmost windows on the first and second stories were moved at one time and opened up (having been shown blind on Latrobe's drawings). The staff opinion was that uncovering the blind windows would only emphasize this misalignment and the unsatisfactory relationship of blind to open windows.

The recommendation was that no alterations be made to the H Street facade until a thorough study is made of Latrobe's drawings and correspondence, and Thomas Waterman's notes.

After the staff report was made the representative from the National Trust withdrew the application; therefore, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer
and Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W., - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT C

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Pavlick:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with you, members of the Department of Public Works and the consultants for Police District #7, at Irving and Alabama Avenue, S.E., during our June 28, 1984 meeting. In approving the design, we had only one caution: that interior furnishings be kept away from the long curvilinear translucent wall, perhaps by a continuous bench. The glow of this wall at night will be an important part of the building's appearance which ought not be obscured by miscellaneous furnishings, filing cabinets, etc., placed up against the wall. We also feel that the proposed landscaping is a key element of the building and our approval is contingent upon its being carried out as shown on the drawings.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. Charles Pavlick
District of Columbia
Department of Public Works
613 G Street, N.W. - Room 901
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Hawkins:

At its 28 June 1984 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.R. 5611, legislation to authorize the Eleventh Airborne Division to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The members had no objection to the intent or the wording of the legislation. The Commission looks forward to working with the Secretary of the Interior in selecting a site and to reviewing designs as they are ready.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

The Honorable
Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman
Committee on House Administration
House of Representatives
Suite H-326, U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20515

EXHIBIT D-1

98TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5611

To authorize the Eleventh Airborne Division Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 8, 1984

Mr. DYSON (for himself and Mr. CONABLE) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

---

A BILL

To authorize the Eleventh Airborne Division Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Eleventh Airborne Division Association is authorized, in accordance with this Act, to establish a memorial on Federal land located in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor the Eleventh Airborne Division, United States Army, popularly known as the "Angels of Liberation".

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Association, select a suitable site

for such memorial on Federal land located in the District of Columbia or its environs.

(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

SEC. 3. Any authority conferred by this Act shall lapse 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act unless—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior determines, before work begins to prepare the site for establishment of the memorial, that sufficient funds are available to insure completion of the memorial, and

(2) such preparation of the site begins during such 5-year period.

SEC. 4. (a) The United States shall not be charged with any expense associated with establishment of the memorial.

(b) Maintenance and care of the memorial shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

○

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D- 2

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Hawkins:

At its 28 June 1984 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.J. Res. 482, legislation to authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to establish a Heroes Memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The members had no objection to the intent of this legislation, but would recommend deletion of lines 13-17 inclusive, page 2, in order to conform to other similar authorizing legislation involving the Commission of Fine Arts:

> If the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, or the National Capital Planning Commission fails to approve or make specific objection to such design and plans within ninety days of submission, his or its approval shall be deemed to be given.

The Commission of Fine Arts meets monthly and will be happy to review the designs for this memorial as soon as they are ready.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

The Honorable
Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman
Committee on House Administration
House of Representatives
Suite H- 326, U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20215

EXHIBIT D-3

98TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 482

To authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Incorporated, to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 9, 1984

Mr. BIAGGI introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Incorporated, to establish a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, is authorized to establish a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor and recognize law enforcement officers in the United States who died in the line of duty. Such memorial shall be known as the National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Incorporated, is authorized and directed to select with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission a suitable site on grounds owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia or its environs.

(b) The Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Incorporated, shall be responsible for the development of a design and plans for such memorial which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission. If the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, or the National Capital Planning Commission fails to approve or make specific objection to such design and plans within ninety days of submission, his or its approval shall be deemed to be given.

(d) Neither the United States nor the District of Columbia shall bear any expense in the establishment of the memorial other than expenses incurred in the process of site selection and approval of design and plans.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this resolution shall lapse unless—

(1) prior to groundbreaking for actual construction of the memorial, funds are certified available in an

amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial in accordance with the approved design and plans, and

(2) the construction of such memorial is commenced within five years from the date of adoption of this resolution.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial established under this resolution shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

○

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D-4

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Hawkins:

At its 28 June 1984 meeting the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.J. Res. 582, legislation to authorize the establishment of a memorial to the American Armored Force on Federal land in Arlington, Virginia.

The members had no objection to the intent or wording of the legislation, concurring that a site in Arlington, beside Memorial Drive, would be appropriate. The Commission looks forward to working with the Secretary of the Interior in selecting this site and to reviewing designs as they are ready.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

The Honorable
Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman
Committee on House Administration
House of Representatives
Suite H-326, U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20515

EXHIBIT D-5

98TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 582

To authorize the Armored Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to erect a memorial to the "American Armored Force" on United States Government property in Arlington, Virginia, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 31, 1984

Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PARRIS) introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the Armored Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to erect a memorial to the "American Armored Force" on United States Government property in Arlington, Virginia, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Armored Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps As-

sociation, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations are authorized jointly to erect a memorial on United States Government property in Arlington, Virginia. Any such memorial shall be erected for the purpose of honoring and commemorating the "American Armored Force", including the members of such organizations and others who have served in armored units of the Armed Forces of the United States during World War I or World War II or in and near Korea or Vietnam, and the members of the Armed Forces who continue to serve with exceptional professionalism to maintain peace worldwide.

SEC. 2. (a)(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall select, with the approval of the national Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on United States Government property in Arlington, Virginia upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section. The Secretary of the Interior shall, if practicable and appropriate, select a site between the Arlington Memorial Bridge and the entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery and beside Memorial Drive.

(2) If the site selected is within the boundaries of the Arlington National Cemetery, the approval of the Secretary of the Army shall be obtained.

(b) The design and plans for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

(c) The United States Government shall not incur any expense in connection with designing, planning, or erecting the memorial except expenses required to carry out the responsibilities set out in this section and sections 3 and 4.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of the memorial is commenced within five years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and (2) prior to its commencement, the Secretary of the Interior has received an appropriate certification that funds are available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of any memorial erected under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

○

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Newell:

The Commission was very pleased to meet with you during its 28 June 1984 meeting at which time final landscape plans were reviewed for the northwest quadrant of the International Center off Connecticut Avenue. While the Commission is happy to inform you that the design has been approved, it recommends that the tree spacing be narrowed along 36th Street and Reno Road. This will require planting more trees than anticipated in your submission, but the result will maintain consistancy with the remainder of the project. Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. Michael B. Newell, Director
International Center Project
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT F

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Thank you for meeting with the Commission on June 28, 1984 and arranging the mock-up windows on the Museum of Natural History for our inspection. Though we hope that nothing will be done to preclude full restoration of the original sash at some point, we feel the proposal of covering the windows with insulated translucent panels and reproducing the existing mutin patterns is acceptable. During our inspection we were surprised by the poor condition of the existing sash and the cluttered appearance of the multitude of items directly behind the glass which give the building a disorderly appearance from the outside. Your proposal will solve those problems while granting a better thermal efficiency to the building's exterior walls.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. John Murphy
Supervising Architect
Smithsonian Institution
Office of Design & Construction
955 L'Enfant Plaza - Suite 3230
Washington, D.C. 20024

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT G

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Faught:

At its 28 June 1984 meeting the Commission reviewed designs for an addition to the NCO Club at Bolling Air Force Base. The Commission noted that the new work would match in style and material the existing building constructed in 1975. The Commission found the proposed extension appropriate and is pleased to tell you that the design has been approved.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught, Director
Planning Division
Chesapeake Division for Naval
Facilities Engineering Command
Department of the Navy
Bldg. 212, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT H

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mrs. Pope:

At its meeting on 28 June 1984 the Commission reviewed designs for the national medal honoring Danny Thomas. There were no objections to the design of the reverse; on the obverse it was recommended that the letters of the work "Humanitarian" follow the curve of the medal and that the lettering style be the same as that used for "Danny Thomas".

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

The Honorable
Donna Pope, Director
United States Mint
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT I

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Lingrell:

The Commission was happy to meet with you on June 28, 1984 and to hear Mr. John Messick's excellent presentation on proposals for The President's Guest House. We are approving the project as presented with the offer to be of any assistance, should problems arise. As with all new construction, the Commission looks forward to reviewing the working drawings, the material samples, and the specific landscape plans.

We are delighted that you have been able to join in our concern about handicapped access from the rear court of the New Executive Office Building. We should add that this will not involve any uncontrolled public access to the Commission's offices, but would be by means of advance arrangement and an escort through the secure area off the 17th Street entrance of the NEOB.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. David Lingrell
GSA - Room 2112
WPCTL
National Capital Region
7th & D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT J

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 3, 1984

Dear Mr. Rich:

At its 28 June 1984 meeting the Commission reviewed a roof deck proposal for the top of the Sears Headquarters Building at Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventh Street. While the design itself is not in character with the special context of the landmark structure within the formal environment of the Federal precinct, it was noted that the facility would be nearly invisible from public space. The Commission recommends in favor of bringing extra life to the Avenue with the proviso that, in terms of the Sears proposal, additional study be given to those portions visible from the street and that the program include lighting for nighttime activities. We look forward to further studies and thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Novak
Acting Chairman

Mr. James Rich
Director of Development
PADC
Pennsylvania Avenue at 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004